



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,924	07/10/2001	Kreisler Lau	30-4907 DIV (4780)	1232

7590 08/22/2002

SANDRA P. THOMPSON  
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP  
611 ANTON BOULEVARD, FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
COSTA MESA, CA 92626-1998

EXAMINER

MULLIS, JEFFREY C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S7

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	licant(s)
	09/902,924	LAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 19-37 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 19-37 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit 1711

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 22-37, drawn to a low dielectric constant material having a first and second polymer, classified in Class 525, subclass 471.

II. Claim 19, drawn to a low dielectric constant polymer, classified in Class 528, subclass 86.

III. Claim 20, drawn to a second low dielectric constant polymer, classified in Class 528, subclass 125.

IV. Claim 21, drawn to thermosetting monomer, classified in Class 568, subclass 303.

Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a coating material or material for fabricating objects and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on

Art Unit 1711

the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a coating material or material for fabricating objects and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions II and IV are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the

Art Unit 1711

intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a monomer for producing a polymer in which one of the monomers has reactive groups but no cage structure but is capable of reacting with the thermosetting monomer of claim 21 and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The inventions of Groups I and IV as well as Group II and Group III as well as Group III and Group IV do not fall within the scope of related and distinct inventions set out in MPEP § 806.05(a)-(i).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Applicants should elect a single backbone by electing either polyarylene ethers or inorganic polymer backbones or polyimides or polyamides

Art Unit 1711

or polyesters as set out on page 6 of the instant specification; applicants should also elect a single cage structure from either adamantane or diadamantane or fullerenes or bridged crown ethers; applicants should also elect a single reactive group from either tolanyl tetracyclone or benzocyclobutenyl or biphenylene.

Applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 20-37 are generic.

Applicants are advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicants must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02 (a).

Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or

Art Unit 1711

identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

It is noted that claim 21 is confusing in that the preamble of this claim recites a thermosetting monomer while the last two lines recite reaction of a first monomer and a second monomer to form a polymer. However for purposes of this restriction requirement it is assumed that applicants are actually claiming a thermosetting monomer in claim 21.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Due to the complexity of this election/restriction requirement, no telephone election was attempted.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey Mullis at telephone number (703) 308-2820.

Serial No. 09/902,924

- 7 -

Art Unit 1711

J. Mullis:cdc

August 21, 2002

Jeffrey Mullis  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1711

